

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, entry of this amendment and reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 52, 58, 63 and 72 have been amended. Claims 52, 58-67 and 72 are pending in this application.

The Examiner rejected independent claims 52, 58, 63 and 72 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over a combination of Akamatsu, Sparks, Hashimoto and Yuen '579 (U.S. Patent No. 5,621,579). Also, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 61 and 66 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over a combination of Akamatsu, Sparks, Hashimoto, Yuen '579 and Yuen '715 (U.S. Patent No. 6,147,715). In addition, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 62 and 67 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over a combination of Akamatsu, Sparks, Hashimoto, Yuen '579, Yuen '715 and Suga.

The present claims, as amended, now recite that "the decoder is for determining whether the transport stream corresponding to the program recorded on the recording medium reproduced by said reproducing apparatus and received through said digital interface is decodable by said decoder." (Emphasis added; independent claims 52, 58 and 63; independent claim 72 contains a similar limitation.) As discussed in the application, a decoder, such as of a receiving apparatus of claim 1, may determine whether a transport stream, which is digitally recorded on a recording medium, which corresponds to a recorded program on the recording medium and which is reproduced from the recording medium by a reproducing apparatus from which the receiving apparatus receives the transport stream, is decodable. In the case where the determination is that the transport stream reproduced by the reproducing apparatus cannot

be decoded, a message is displayed showing that the program recorded on the recording medium is recorded such that the reproduced transport stream corresponding to the program recorded on the recording medium cannot be decoded. Based on the display of a message indicating that the transport stream corresponding to the recorded program reproduced by the reproducing apparatus and received through the digital interface cannot be decoded by the decoder, the user can recognize that, for example, a recording mode or streaming format of the transport stream corresponding to the recorded program is the reason why the transport stream cannot be decoded, and, therefore, take an appropriate action. (See specification, for example, at pp. 53-54). Consequently, the user is notified, by display of such message, to prevent user confusion when, for example, the transport stream, which corresponds to a program recorded on a tape cassette loaded into the reproducing apparatus, and which is reproduced by the reproducing apparatus, is of a different specification or a different broadcasting service.

As admitted by the Examiner, the applied portions of Akamatsu, which appear concern display of information associated with a program(s) to be recorded, and Sparks, which appear to disclose displaying a message together with a decoded video signal, alone or in combination, do not disclose displaying a message based on a determination by a decoder of a receiving apparatus. In addition, Akamatsu and Sparks do not appear to disclose or suggest a decoder for determining whether the transport stream corresponding to the program recorded on the recording medium, where the transport stream is reproduced by a reproducing apparatus in which the recording medium is loaded and is received through a digital interface of the claimed receiving apparatus, can be decoded and, furthermore, displaying

a message based on the determination by the decoder, as required by the claimed invention.

Hashimoto and Yuen, alone or in combination, do not cure the deficiencies of Akamatsu or Sparks with respect to the requirements of the claimed invention. In contrast to the Examiner's statements, the applied portions of Hashimoto do not appear to describe "notify[ing] the user of a problem that may arise in program recording or reproduction." (Emphasis in original, Official Action pg. 4). Rather, the applied portions of Hashimoto appear to disclose adjusting a video monitor for displaying an input video signal which does not require decoding to be displayed, and displaying an error message if scanning frequencies of the input video signal are out of the adjustable range of the monitor or if no video signal is present. Thus, Hashimoto is not concerned with, and does not appear to disclose or suggest, determining whether a transport stream corresponding to a program recorded on a recording medium "is decodable" at a receiving apparatus, which receives the reproduced transport stream, and does not disclose notifying a user, with a message on a display, that the program recorded on the recording medium is recorded such that the corresponding transport stream cannot be decoded.

In addition, Yuen appears to disclose displaying information associated with a program(s) recorded on a tape (recording medium) loaded in a VCR system (reproducing apparatus), such as a title of a program or a selected video frame (SVF) representative of a program recorded on the tape, where the displayed information is obtained from a separate memory (RAM or SRAM) of the VCR system or an initial portion of the tape and displayed without performing any decoding on the information. (See Col. 15, ln. 66-Col. 16, ln. 50). Contrary to the Examiner's statements, the display of the SVF of the

program is not an inherent disclosure that the VCR system has the ability to determine whether the "program" recorded on the tape is decodable and, in particular, to determine whether a transport stream corresponding to a program recorded on the tape is decodable. The display of the SVF in Yuen does not mean, as stated by the Examiner, that the "program is indeed decodable." Thus, the applied portions of Yuen do not appear to disclose or suggest determining whether the transport stream corresponding to a program recorded on a recording medium which is reproduced is decodable, as required by the claimed invention.

Thus, Applicants request that the rejection of the pending claims be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 09/600,003

Docket No.: SONYSU 3.3-086

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Davy E. Zonsraich

Registration No.: 37,267

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

LD-447A
1052045_1.DOC